



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,756	01/04/2007	Franz Stuhlbacher	P30892	3798
7055 7590 07/08/2010 GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191				
EXAMINER MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3751				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/08/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/599,756

Applicant(s)

STUHLBACHER ET AL.

Examiner

Timothy L. Maust

Art Unit

3751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2010.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 22-27 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 28-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 16 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 and 28-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 4, "located least one of" is grammatically incorrect. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 13-17, 19-21 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poschinger in view of Tunney et al. (6635119)

The Poschinger reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed in the office action dated 2/3/10).

Regarding claims 16 and 29, A gas container (1; propane gas cylinder) for storing gases under pressures exceeding 50 bar comprising an electrically conducting

stretched aluminum material (4; see Figure 3). Further, the container is capable of being pressurized to over 200 bar. Poschinger fails to disclose an electrical ground connection to **at least one** of the stretched material and in the vicinity of the outlet opening. However, the Tunney et al. reference disclose another gas container (402) having a ground connection (see step 104) to a lug on the container or in any other location apparent to a person skilled in the art (see col. 7, lines 29-34) to minimize spark and possible ignition of the chemical. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Poschinger device to have an electrical ground attached at a location on or in the container in view of the teachings of the Tunney et al. reference in order to minimize spark and possible ignition of the chemical or gas contained therein.

Regarding claims 17, 28 and 30, wherein the stretched material has a volumetric content of 2 to 4 %, which is the range of 0.5 to 8.5 percent and 1.0 to 5.0 percent of the total volume of the container (see col. 3, line 66 - col. 4, line 3).

Regarding claim 19, wherein the stretched material is arranged ascending from a base of the container (see Figure 6).

Regarding claim 20, wherein the stretched material is uniformly distributed throughout the entire volume of the container (see Figure 6).

Regarding claim 21, wherein stretched material is arranged in the area of an opening of the gas container. As seen in Figure 1, the filler inlay (4) is arranged in the area of the opening (at valve 5) in the tank.

Regarding claims 1, 2, 4-11 and 13-15, the method as claimed would be inherent during normal use and operation of the device.

Claims 3 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poschinger in view of Tunney et al. (above) and further in view of Schrenk (4613054).

The Poschinger reference discloses the invention as modified by the Tunney et al. reference (discussed supra), but doesn't disclose the stretched material (4) being in separate spherical or cylindrical forms. However, the Schrenk (4613054) reference discloses another gas container having spherical filler bodies (10) to prevent explosive combustion in combustible liquid or gases in receptacles. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to fill the Poschinger device with spherical stretched material in place of the present form of stretched material as, for example, taught by Schrenk, wherein so doing would amount to mere substitution of one functional equivalent form of stretched material for another within the same art and the selection of any of these would work equally well in the Poschinger device.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poschinger in view of Tunney et al.

Poschinger discloses the invention as claimed (discussed supra), but does not disclose the stretched material being made of plastic. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

make the device of plastic, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 22-27 are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L. Maust whose telephone number is (571) 272-4891. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. 7:00-5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy L Maust/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

7/2/10